



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,505	01/09/2002	Gary J. Cross	AUS920010952US1	6747
35525	7590	11/20/2007		
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER HOFFMAN, BRANDON S	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10042505	1/9/02	CROSS, GARY J.	AUS920010952US1

IBM CORP (YA)  
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC  
P.O. BOX 802333  
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

Brandon S. Hoffman

ART UNIT	PAPER
2136	20071116

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Appellant filed a notice of appeal and after final remarks on June 27, 2006. Examiner entered the remarks and provided an advisory action on July 7, 2006. Appellant filed an appeal brief on August 28, 2006, stating that an after final was filed and the examiner did not enter the amendment. However, as can be seen from the advisory action of July 7, 2006, examiner did enter the amendment. In response to the appeal brief of August 28, 2006, examiner sent out an examiners answer, on November 15, 2006, stating that the appellants did not file any after final amendments and that their "statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct." However, examiner missed the fact that the advisory action had entered the after final remarks by the appellant. Therefore, in summary, appellant did file after final remarks which were entered by the examiner.

NASSER MOAZZAMI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

11/19/07